U NITED S TATES P ATENT AND T RADEMARK O FFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,146	06/20/2001	John E. Brezak	14917.0461US01	5712

27488   7590   06/11/2009
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
BARQADLE, YASIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2456	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 February 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *40,43,46-50,52,53,55-57 and 62-64* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *40,43,46-50,52,53,55-57 and 62-64* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1.   The amendment filed on February 17, 2009 has been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

- 40,43,46-50,52,53,55-57 and 62-64 are presented for examination

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments are not specific enough to address them one-by-one. Therefore, the Applicant is referred to the detailed office action below.

The only limitation that seems new is forwardable flag limitation which is implied in the following section of Swift and in Kerberos authentication "where GrantedAccountSID1 is the SID of a client permitted to be a proxy of the user, and GrantedGroupSID2 is the SID of a group of clients, each of which is allowed to be a proxy. The dates in this example indicate the expiration dates for the proxy permissions for the respective principals. The third field of the proxy entry in this example identifies the services the proxy is allowed to access on behalf of the user. Such restriction data may be specified in many different ways with different granularity. For instance, this field may be used to specify groups or individual clients that the proxy can access. Alternatively, the field can provide a negative restriction by identifying those services the proxy should not be allowed to access. The field may identify specifically the directory the proxy is allowed

to access, as in the second proxy entry in the example." (col. 7, lines
53 to col. 8, lines 40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in
this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another
> filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an
> international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1),
> (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for
> patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors
Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology
Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S.
patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed
before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is
determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-
AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

40,43,46,48-50,52,53,55,57 and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
102(e) as being anticipated by Swift et al US Patent Number (7,113,994),
hereinafter "Swift".

The applied reference has a common assignee or inventor with the
instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the
reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under
35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132

that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from
the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or
by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As per claim 40 Swift teaches a method for constraining delegation of service
requests made by a first server (proxy client 74, fig. 2) on behalf of client (client
70, abstract and fig. 2) , the method comprising:
receiving, at the first server, an authentication mechanism for the client,
wherein the authentication mechanism is generated using a first
authentication method (col. 5, lines 4-40);

 sending a request to a trusted third-party to issue a first service ticket to
the first server for the client, wherein the first service ticket is adapted to be
used with a second authentication method, and wherein the second
authentication method is different from the first authentication method (col. 5,
lines 11-47. See also col. 2, lines 39-43));

 receiving, at the first server, the first service ticket to the first server,
wherein the first service ticket to the first server specifies that the first service
ticket is delegable through the presence of a forwardable flag in the first service
ticket (col. 5, lines 4-40 and fig. 2, items 84,82 and 90; col. 2, lines 16-43 and
col. 8, lines 10-44 forwardable flag is interpreted information included in the
proxy entry to specify what the proxy is allowed to do including restrictions on
the permissions "where GrantedAccountSID1 is the SID of a client permitted to
be a proxy of the user, and GrantedGroupSID2 is the SID of a group of clients,
each of which is allowed to be a proxy... The third field of the proxy entry in
this example identifies the services the proxy is allowed to access on behalf of
the user. Such restriction data may be specified in many different ways with
different granularity. For instance, this field may be used to specify groups or
individual clients that the proxy can access. Alternatively, the field can provide
a negative restriction by identifying those services the proxy should not be

allowed to access. The field may identify specifically the directory the proxy is allowed to access, as in the second proxy entry in the example."(col. 7, lines 53 to col. 8, lines 40);

requesting, by the first server, a target service ticket from the trusted third-party (trusted security server 80, fig. 2) configured for use by the first server to access the target service on behalf of the client (col. 5, lines 4-40 and fig. 2, items 84,82 and 90, wherein the first server provides the trusted third-party with the first service ticket when requesting the target service ticket, and wherein the target service ticket is adapted to be used with the second authentication method (col. 2, lines 16-43 and col. 8, lines 10-44); and sending the target service ticket to the target server (target service 76); and

sending the target service ticket to the target server (fig. 2, 92 and col. 5,lines 49-55).

As per claims 49-50, 57 and 62 Swift teaches the invention as explained in claim 40 (see also figures 1-4 and col. 4, lines 4-55). These claims include variations of similar limitations addressed in claim 1 above; therefore they are rejected with the same rationale. Regarding the determining of the presence of forwardable flag in the first service, Swift teaches information included in the proxy entry is interpreted to specify what the proxy is allowed to do including restrictions on the permissions "where GrantedAccountSID1 is the SID of a client permitted to be a proxy of the user, and GrantedGroupSID2 is the SID of a group of clients, each of which is allowed to be a proxy. The dates in this example indicate the expiration dates for the proxy permissions for the respective principals. The third field of the proxy entry in this example identifies the services the proxy is allowed to access on behalf of the user. Such restriction data may be specified in many different ways with different granularity. For instance, this field may be used to specify groups or individual

clients that the proxy can access. Alternatively, the field can provide a negative restriction by identifying those services the proxy should not be allowed to access. The field may identify specifically the directory the proxy is allowed to access, as in the second proxy entry in the example." ticket (col. 5, lines 4-40 and fig. 2, items 84,82 and 90; col. 2, lines 16-43 and col. 8, lines 10-44)

In referring to claims 43 and 52
- Where the target service ticket is configured for use by the server and the target service to which service is sought: See Figures 8 and 9 and (col. 5, lines 35-55).

In referring to claims 46 and 55,
- The server is a front-end server with respect to a back-end server that is coupled to the front-end server: The proxy is a front-end server with respect to the client
- The back-end server is configured to provide the target service to which access is sought. The target service is a back -end server with respect to the client (see fig. 2)

In referring to claims 48 and 64, wherein the second authentication method includes a Kerberos authentication protocol (fig. 3)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which *forms* the basis *for all* obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 47, 56 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift in view of Freier et al. *("The SSL Protocol Version 3.0",* 18 Nov 1996, hereinafter *"Freier")*. Although Swift shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Swift does not show using SSL as the first authentication method. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Swift as evidenced by Freier.

In analogous art, Freier discloses SSL version 3.0. Freier shows SSL can be used to provide communication privacy over the Internet (abstract).

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Swift so as to use SSL, such as taught by Freier, in order to provide security for applications that don't support Kerberos authentication (For example, Outlook and Netscape email clients).

Conclusion

5.   **ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In

no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX
MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent
to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications
from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone
number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM
to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the
examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-
3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or
proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained
from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status
information for published applications may be obtained from either Private
PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is
available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access
to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at
866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer
Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call
800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yasin M Barqadle/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456